A N

ANSWER

TO THE

EXAMINATION

OF THE

REMARKS

ON THE

ACCOUNT of a *Controverſy* between the AUTHOR of the TRIAL of Mr. *Whitefield*'s Spirit, and BENJAMIN MILLS, a *Diſſenting Miniſter* at *Maidſtone* in *Kent*,

IN WHICH,

The EXAMINER's Exceptions to the DEFENCE of the *Paragraph*, are ſhewn to be only his *Own* Perverſions and Miſrepreſentations; the REMARKS reſcued from his falſe and unjuſt Charges; and the AUTHOR from *his* groundleſs Aſperſions, Calumnies and Slanders.

In a SECOND LETTER to a Friend.

Happy is the man that condemneth not himſelf, in that thing which he alloweth. Rom. xiv. 22.

LONDON:

Printed for T. COOPER, at the *Globe* in *Pater-Noſter-Row*.

MDCCXLI.

AN ANSWER TO THE EXAMINATION, &c.

DEAR SIR,

Sept. 17. 1741.

IT is but a *few Days*, ſince I received the *Pamphlet* you ſent me, with the *Letter* accompanying it; and thank you for the Regard you ſhew in it for *me* and *my* Reputation, as well as for *Truth*. The *Author* (as you obſerve) goes on much in the ſame *Strain* and *Spirit* as in his former; only uſing *me* ſo much *worſe* than the *other* Gentleman, as he eſteem'd *me* inſtrumental in ſetting *his Uſage* of him in its true Light before the World. Indeed, the whole Pamphlet from beginning to end, is little elſe but a continued Series of *Miſrepreſentations*, and *unjuſt* and *abuſive Reflections*, and ſome of them ſo *coarſe*, that they would better have become a *Diſputant* among *the Dregs and Scum of the Vulgar*, than a *Chriſtian Miniſter*, a *Gentleman*, or a *Scholar*. P. 37.

This made me at firſt, in ſome doubt, whether (notwithſtanding your earneſt Importunity) it would not be the more prudent Way to follow the Example of *my Friend*, whoſe Vindication I undertook, and have nothing farther to do with a *Writer*, of whom it may be truly ſaid, as a wor-

thy Man once did of a ſcurrilous Antagoniſt of his, that "he is an OVER-MATCH for any "CHRISTIAN."

And this way I ſhould certainly have taken, were it not that I *looked on myſelf concerned to vindicate* my Character from a vile *Scandal* or two, which he has had the *modeſt Aſſurance* to caſt upon
P. 26. me; repreſenting me to the World, as *not aſhamed to publiſh a manifeſt Calumny*, and *having no more regard for my Reputation* than *to ſend abroad a groſs Slander*; and as deſiring to *have the World look up-*
P. 15. *on all Nonconformiſts to be alike*, and *throwing out Inſinuations againſt Diſſenters in the General*; when he cannot produce a ſingle Inſtance of this kind, and knows that I had particularly *diſtinguiſhed* one ſort of *Non-conformiſts* from another.

Theſe unjuſt *Imputations* I could, by no means, ſit down under; but am, at the ſame time, fully determined that nothing this *Gentleman* ſhall hereafter ſay *to me*, or *of me*, but a Provocation of the *ſame* Kind (which I do not think him *incapable* of giving) ſhall ever engage me to trouble the World, or my Friends, again in this manner. I thank God, I know too, how to ſpend my time to better Purpoſe, and more to my Satisfaction.

In the *Remarks*, I was ſenſible (as I before declared) there were many *Defects*, *Redundancies*, and *Inaccuracies*; meaning, ſome things paſs'd over proper to have been taken notice of; others enlarged on, that might well enough have been contracted; and want of that Exactneſs throughout, which farther Conſideration might have given them.

However, as they were, I thought them capable of anſwering the Ends of my writing them; and eſpecially one great End I aimed at; which was, not merely to vindicate the Paſſage in the *Trial*, and to do ſome Juſtice to a worthy Man,

who

who honours me with his Friendſhip, but to preſerve the People under his Charge from being unſettled, or led away from our Communion by a plauſible Declaimer, who ſeems very deſirous and notably induſtrious, to increaſe his Party, and to *draw away Diſciples* after him, under the ſmooth Pretences of *Liberty* and *Charity*.

He takes Occaſion to tell *me* "he is very fond P. 20.
"of the *Cauſe* of *Liberty*, and that it is what
"every *Proteſtant* ought highly to value." I hope therefore, I may have Leave to ſay, if *he* be very fond of the *Cauſe* of *Liberty*, *ſo am I*; but at the ſame Time, *I frankly acknowledge*, I know how to diſtinguiſh between that *Liberty wherewith Chriſt has made us free*, and that *Licentiouſneſs*, which would ſpeciouſly cloath itſelf in the amiable Colours of *Liberty*, and, under that fair Diſguiſe, cauſeleſsly break in upon the ſettled Order of Publick Eſtabliſhments, whether *Eccleſiaſtical* or *Civil*. I am as much concerned for *true* and *real Charity*, both in Principle and Practice; but I cannot think the keeping up *Unneceſſary Separations* in the Church of *Chriſt*, does any Way contribute to the ſpreading of ſo lovely and neceſſary a Virtue; on the contrary, I aſſure the *Examiner*, Exam.
I am one of thoſe, who think "that nothing has p. 13.
"made more *dreadful Havock* in the *Chriſtian* Account,
"*World*, and in our *own* Nation in particular, p. 28.
"than ſuch *cauſeleſs Schiſms* and *Diviſions*." The Gentleman himſelf has owned, that even "*Di-* P. 27.
"*verſities* in religious Opinions and Uſages, have,
"of all other Things, the greateſt Influence upon
"the Tempers of Men, to *ſour* and *irritate* them
"one againſt another." This makes me think, that the CAUSE of LIBERTY and CHARITY, is a very DIFFERENT Thing, from the CAUSE of NON-CONFORMITY; and conſequently, that a Man may be *very fond* of the *former*,

former, and yet be unwilling to give any Encouragement to the *latter*.

This Maſter of Iſrael pleaſes himſelf with ſaying a ſmart thing that ſeems intended, as it ſtands in his Pamphlet, to be a Specimen, both of his *Wit* and his *Candour*; viz. that he *hopes this Curate's Writing is vain*. But it is a Satisfaction to the *Curate* (for he is not aſhamed of his Character, though *this Teacher*, by his dull and frequent Repetition of the Word, ſeems to think it ſome kind of *Reproach* or *Diminution* to be a *Curate*, it is a Satisfaction to him) that *his Writing* has had *one* good Effect already; in that it has cauſed the *Examiner* to open himſelf in a manner he did not think fit to do before.

Exam. P. 32.

The Principles of his *ſober* and *charitable* Nonconformity are now broadly intimated, if not expreſsly declared, to be, that the Church of *England* is, in many Inſtances, *remote from Apoſtolical Purity*——that it is *ſchiſmatical*, and has in its religious Order and Government, ſo great *a Leven of Popery*, that the *Salters-Hall* Preachers might very properly, from the *ſame* Text and Subject, expoſe the *Corruptions* of the Church of *Rome*, and the Church of *England*. And if this *Proteſtant Church* of ours, which *I ſaid* (and ſay *again*) is the *Glory and Bulwark of the Reformation*, were indeed *ſuch* a Church as it is here repreſented, I ſhould not differ from him in his other Reflection, *viz. that it is a Church not worth ſupporting*.

P. 13.

P. 38.

But at the ſame time, I beg leave to tell this *Writer*, that the World about us will probably think, it would better have become *him*, who had been making ſuch *preſſing Demands* on the *Author* of the *Trial*, to attempt to *prove* theſe heavy Charges, rather than throw out his random *Inſinuations* and *Reflections*, as he is pleaſed to do *in his ſober and charitable Spirit of Non-conformity*.

He

He makes a *farther* Diſcovery of his *ſober* and *moderate* Principles, in approving and vindicating the Paſſage I tranſcribed from the *Aſſembly-Sermon* P. 17. at *Exeter*. Every Reader cannot but obſerve in it as much *Bitterneſs* and *Animoſity* againſt the *Eſtabliſhed Church*, as is to be found in the Writings of the moſt *fiery Zealots* among them, either in the *former* or *preſent* Times. It is the very Language of *Martin Mar-Prelate* in Queen *Elizabeth*'s Days, and of *Leighton* and *Burton* in a following Reign, *Root* and *Branch* all over. Mr. *M.*'s Quotation from the Great Dr. *Barrow*, is neither *in Effect*, or any *other* Way, any more like that from the *Preacher*, than his *own* Manner of Writing is like the Doctor's; as it would be very eaſy to ſhew, were it not ſo viſible in itſelf, that there is no Need to ſpend Time about it. It was the Man's *dipping his Pen ſo* much *in Gall*, in that ſhort Paragraph, that I intended to point out to the Reader; and Mr. *M.* ſeems to give his *Aſſent and Conſent* to it all, and to add *his Amen* to that of the *Aſſemblies*; compoſed it ſeems of *ſober* and *charitable* Non-conformiſt-Miniſters, gathered together from the *large* and *extenſive* Counties of *Devon* and *Cornwall*. There is nothing here *wiſhed* or *prayed* for, but "that all thoſe *Powers* and "*Poſſeſſions*, *Cuſtoms* and *Conſtitutions*, which *this* "*Preacher*, with equal *Abſurdity* and *Falſehood*, "ſays *have been artfully* annexed to Chriſtianity "in the *Eſtabliſhed Church*, (that is, the whole "Frame of our *Proteſtant Eſtabliſhment*) may be "expoſed to publick *Contempt* and *Ridicule*; its "*mercenary Supporters* (that is, *the whole Clergy* "*of the Realm, however dignified or diſtinguiſhed*) "FORCED out of their ſtrong Intrenchments, "and OBLIGED to ſacrifice them all to the "common Good of Mankind, *&c.*

Let

Let me here (by the way) aſk Mr. *M.* Whether what *this* Preacher ſays, and *he* ſeems ſo much to approve, is to be called by the ſoft Name of DISLIKING, or whether he will pleaſe to allow that it looks like DESPISING *the religious Order and Government of the Church of England?* He ſays, *he* ſhall never take upon him to defend the bad Doings in the Days of their *Fathers*; but the *wiſhing* and *praying* for ſuch a Scene *now*, is much the ſame with *approving* what is *paſt*.

Rem. p. 28.

But I could ſcarce forbear ſmiling, to ſee the following Paſſage drop from his Pen——"He earneſtly wiſhes for the Time when all thoſe "Things ſhall be laid aſide in the Church, without which the Chriſtian Church did *at firſt*, and "may ſtill ſubſiſt." The Chriſtian Church did *at firſt* ſubſiſt without handſome and convenient *Edifices* for their *Aſſemblies*——without a *ſettled Maintenance* for their Paſtors——and without ſeveral *other* Things, which though not abſolutely neceſſary to the *Being* of the Church, are yet not only *harmleſs* and *innocent*, but *uſeful* and *convenient*; and therefore there ſeems no Reaſon for wiſhing or endeavouring that *all* thoſe Things ſhould be laid aſide; eſpecially, when it is conſidered, that were it not for *one* of *theſe things*, it is probacle the SEPARATION, no more than the Church he *thinks not worth ſupporting*, would not long SUBSIST. "Such *diſmal* Work do "Men make of it; to ſuch *manifeſt Abſurdities* do "they frequently reduce themſelves and their "Cauſe, when they ſuffer their Zeal to run away "with their Judgment." They make no Difference betwixt *Friends* and *Foes*, but like *Sampſon*, pull down the Houſe on their own Heads, as well as their Enemies.

P. 18.

This

This Diſcovery of the Gentleman's *Principles* and *Diſpoſition*, will, I truſt and believe, render the *Remarks* of the more Uſe to the Perſons for whoſe Service they were principally written, and be a Means of keeping them in the Communion of that *excellent* Church (I call it ſo ſtill, as being not at all the *worſe* for any Thing *he* ſays of it) they are Members of: They will not now be ſo eaſily ſeduced by *ſuch a Man as he*, but will more carefully *mark them that cauſe Diviſions, and avoid them.*

If this *great End* be gained, I ſhall not be much concerned about that Load of *Miſrepreſentations*, and abuſive *Inſinuations* and *Reflections* he beſtows upon *me:* Nor ſhall I greatly trouble myſelf whether what he ſays of the *Weakneſs* and *Inconſiſtency* of my *Defence of the Paragraph* be true or falſe—that was the *leaſt* Part of my Concern. I did not at firſt intend to have taken ſo much Notice of his *Inference* from the *Author*'s Words, or to enquire what Ground there might poſſibly be for *ſuch* an Inference; but deſigned to proceed upon the *Suppoſition* that there might be ſome *Colour* or *Pretence* to charge them with *inſinuating that the Diſſenters were out of the Communion of the Church of Chriſt*, and to ſhew (as is done from *p.* 8 of the *Remarks*) that, even upon this *Suppoſition*, the *Author* is treated by the *Controverſy-Writer* in a moſt *uncharitable*, *indecent*, and *unjuſtifiable* Manner——in a Manner not at all becoming a truly *moderate Nonconformiſt-Miniſter.*

But, notwithſtanding this, I ſhall not wholly neglect what Mr. *M.* has offered in the Examination of the Remarks, or quite overlook the Charge brought againſt them on *this* Head; and I doubt not to make it appear to the Satisfaction of every Reader, that (as *ſubtle* and *acute* a Diſputant as he ſeems to take himſelf to be, or may be thought

to be by ſome others) if he had not groſsly *miſconſtrued*, *perverted*, and *abuſed* my Words, he could have found no Shadow or Pretence for charging me, as he does in the moſt contemptuous Manner, with writing *inconſiſtently*——endeavouring to *reconcile Contradictions*——undertaking to *defend what is altogether undefenſible*, and *leaving the Matter in the ſame bad Plight I found it in.*

How *little* Ground the Man has, for theſe high Airs, a few Words will plainly ſhew to the intelligent and obſerving Reader.

Rem p 5, 6. When it is ſaid, that "thoſe *Diſſenters* are *ſpecified* in the *Trial*, whom it intimates (if it intimates *any*) to be *out of the Communion of Chriſt's Church*;" and deſcribes them in the Words following, this is underſtood by the *Examiner*, as if it was aſſerted, that to *deſpiſe* the religious Order and Government of the Church of *England*, puts Men out of the Communion of *Chriſt's Church*; and then he couples with this, a Paſſage in the *Remarks*, where it is obſerved, that the *whole Body* of the *Diſſenters*, *all the Diſſenters in the Lump*, and not many of them only, *deſpiſe* the religious Order and Government of the *Church of England* (as it is too evident they do, for all his ſhuffling *Diſtinction* between *diſliking* and *deſpiſing*) and the notable Feat is performed, of making me ſay, that *all* the Diſſenters are, *by the Paragraph*, excluded the Communion of *Chriſt's Church*; and ſo *contradicting myſelf*, *deciding againſt myſelf*, and *demoliſhing my Defence of the Paragraph.* And, I muſt confeſs, if I had really done as Mr. *M.* would have me, the *Author* of the *Trial* would owe me as *little Thanks for the Defence I have made of the Paragraph*, as I do *him* for this *falſe* and *partial Repreſentation.* For,

Exam. p 8, 9.

Rem p. 10.

The

The Truth is, this is, *all over*, a mere *Fiction* and *Invention* of his own. I no where *intimate* or *inſinuate*, that the Words of the *Trial* put Men out of the Communion of *Chriſt's Church* for *deſpiſing the Religious Order and Government of the Church of England*—or, that only *Diſpiſers* of theſe are out of the Communion of *Chriſt's Church*, (as he would have it believed) but keep *exactly* to the Terms of the *Author*—and inſiſt upon it, that, if *any* Diſſenters are *intimated* in the *Paragraph*, to be out of the Communion of Chriſt's Chriſt, it can be ſuch *only* as deſpiſe (not *only* the Religious Order and Government of the Church of *England*, but) *all* Religious Order and Government; ſuch as *diſobey them that have the Rule over them*, and, *through a contentious Spirit, bring among Chriſtians Confuſion and every evil Work*. P. 8, 9.

Theſe are the *Diſſenters* which the Words in the *Trial ſpecify* and *deſcribe* [and ſome ſuch, the *Examiner* owns there are among them]; and conſequently I contend that *theſe* are the *only* Diſſenters that can be ſpoken of, as out of the Communion of *the Church of Chriſt*, (if the Author intended to intimate that *any* were ſo.) For which Reaſon I truly ſaid the Words *were not* CAPABLE of the Senſe Mr. *M.* put upon them. This, I think, is as clear as it would be to ſay, that any thing aſſerted or *intimated* of *ſome particular* Perſons only, in Contradiſtinction to *others*, can by no Grammatical Conſtruction, be extended to *all* Perſons in *general*.

Such Perſons indeed, may well be ſaid to deſpiſe the religious Order and Government of the *Eſtabliſhed Church*, who deſpiſe *all* religious Order and Government; but *that* is not the *only* Thing, or the *main* Thing mentioned in the *Paragraph* or *Remarks*; but the doing this with the ſeveral Circumſtances of *Uncharitableneſs* and *Contentiouſneſs*,

tentiouſneſs, and indeed, a general *Licentiouſneſs of Principles* and *Practices* with regard to *Church Communion*. If, as this *Writer* ſays, *this is a Fault* [rather a Complication of Faults, if that be not too gentle a Name for them] chargeable on *others*, as well as ſome *Diſſenters*, what is *that* to the purpoſe? If what is ſaid of many *Diſſenters*, be true alſo of *many who belong to the Eſtabliſhment*, it is not, for *that* reaſon, the *leſs* true of *thoſe* Diſſenters; nor did the Author any where ſay that there were *none* pretending to be of the Church of *England* obnoxious to the ſame Cenſure; or that ſuch Perſons, notwithſtanding their acting as the *Paragraph deſcribes*, are ſtill really in the Communion of *Chriſt's Church*. For my Part, I make no Scruple to own, that, *whoever* they are, and under what Name ſoever they may paſs, (whether they be *termed Diſſenters* or *Churchmen*) that behave themſelves in *ſuch* a Manner, they are equally out of the Communion of *Chriſt's Church*, and have no Pretence to be regarded as Members of it. Be they *who* they will, "if they deſpiſe "all religious Order and Government; if they "diſobey them that have the Rule over them; "and, through a contentious Spirit, bring among "Chriſtians *Confuſion and every evil Work*," I will ſay of them, as the moſt *judicious*, as well as *ſober* and *moderate* Biſhop *Jewel* did of ſome in the beginning of the *Separation*, whom he ſtiles *proud*, *ſelf-conceited*, *diſobedient* and *unquiet* Men, Diſturbers of the Church's Peace—"By what *Name* ſhall I "call them? I would I might call them *Brethren*: "But alas, this Heart of theirs is not *Brotherly*; "I would I might call them *Chriſtians*: But alas, "they are *no Chriſtians*. I know not by what "Name I ſhall call them: For if they were "*Brethren*, they would love as *Brethren*: If they "were *Chriſtians*, they would agree as *Chriſtians*."

Acct. p. 12.

Exam. p. 8.

Acct. p. 14.

Serm. at Paul's *Croſs, in his Works.*

The

The Reflection the *Writer* of his *Life* makes on this Paſſage is, " If the Biſhop thought *theſe* " Men did not deſerve the Title of *Brethren* or " *Chriſtians*, what would he have ſaid, if he had " lived in *our* Days?" P. 44.

This being obſerved, we ſhall the more eaſily anſwer his next Charge, and ſhew, that the *Remarker* might very properly, and without the Shadow of a Contradiction, aſſert, that " the *Au-* " *thor* of the *Trial* did not *aggravate* Matters, " when he wrote, that *many* a Diſſenter in *Eng-* " *land*, hath no Suſpicion of Miſtake, nor Scru- " ple of Conſcience, nor Apprehenſion of Sin, " in deſpiſing all Religious Order and Govern- " ment, and diſobeying thoſe that have *the Rule* " *over them by the Laws of this Realm*.". Mr. *M.* in order to make his uſe of this Paſſage, [that is, in order to miſrepreſent both the *Words* and the *Author*] makes it an EXPLICATION of what is ſaid in the *Trial*; which they have not the leaſt Concern with; being uſed only as *proper* Words to introduce the Inſtance which *follows*, of ſome *Diſſenters* who in the higheſt Degree, and in a moſt notorious Manner, DESPISED Religious Order and Government, and diſobeyed them that have the Rule over them *by the Laws of this Realm*. This is evident, in that the *laſt* Words are *diſtinguiſhed* from the reſt; and the *whole Paſſage* is only an *Alluſion* to the *Words* of the *Trial*, not a *Tranſcript* of them. His *Doubt* therefore, whether I had *leave for this Explication*, when there is not the Shadow of a Reaſon for calling it by *that* Name, is like the reſt; and muſt by the *Figure* called *Redundancy*, be ſtiled *Impertinence*; and nothing better. P. 9. P. 9. P. 17. P. 35.

His only *proper Anſwer* to *this*, would have been to have *withdrawn* every Part of his *Conceſſion*, and attempted to convince the World (in ſpight

ſpight of his own Acknowledgment) that there is *not many a Diſſenter* in *England*, who *deſpiſes* Religious Order and Government, and *diſobeys thoſe that have the Rule over him by the Laws of this Realm*, without Suſpicion of Miſtake, or Scruple of Conſcience, or Apprehenſion of Sin. If he had done this, he would have made it evident, that both the *Author* of the *Trial* and *Remarks* had *aggravated Matters* in a high Degree, in what they wrote concerning them; but, till then, the leaſt that can be ſaid is, that what *he* has wrote, is as impertinent as his *Doubt*, whether I had leave for ſuch an *Explication*.

The ſame ſort of Perverſion may be obſerved in his extraordinary Comment on the Words he has quoted from another Page of the *Remarks*.

Exam. p. 10, "Where is the *Crime* then (if this were *really the* "Caſe) of ſuppoſing that there may be a *Depar-* "*ture or Separation from* the Communion of "*Chriſt's Church*, or the Society and Fellowſhip "of Chriſtians, and of inſinuating that *ſome* of "thoſe, who thus ſeparate themſelves, may be ſo "inſenſible of their Sin in ſo doing, as to have "their Blood run chill or cold at the very "Thoughts of their being wrong in not joining "themſelves to their Chriſtian Brethren, *&c?*" If this clear-ſighted Gentleman, will only pleaſe to withdraw his *own* abſurd *Comment* from *my* Words, [which are plain enough without his help] he ſhall have my free Conſent to make the moſt of this Paſſage, as well as of the former, and of the *Blunder* he ſpies in it, into the Bargain. The Senſe of the whole Paſſage is ſufficiently obvious. If *this were really the Caſe*; that is, if the Author of the *Trial*, in the conteſted Paragraph, *really* intended to inſinuate that the Perſons he ſpeaks of, were out of the Communion of *Chriſt's Church*: Which it appears was *not* in his Thoughts; for he

uſed

uſed thoſe Words *inadvertently*, meaning by them the Church of *England*; and therefore this was only a *Suppoſition* and *not really the Caſe*: But if he had ſuppoſed that *ſome* of thoſe who *ſeparate themſelves*, [not if he had ſuppoſed that there is *a Departure or Separation of the Diſſenters, as ſuch*, &c. which is his *own* abuſive *Addition*] behaving in the manner there deſcribed, are departed or ſeparated from the Communion of *Chriſt's Church*, where is the Crime of *ſuch* a *Suppoſition?*

Hence then, it is evident, that this is a very *innocent* Paſſage, and guilty of no *Crime*, but one of Mr. *M*'s. making. It affords no colour for charging the *Author* of it with allowing that it is *really the Caſe, that the Paragraph ſuppoſes there is a Departure of the Diſſenters, as ſuch, from the Communion of Chriſt's Church*; and how Mr. *M.* when he is talking of *Chriſtian Principles*, could dare to aſſert ſo *falſe* a Thing as that *this* Interpretation appeared to me *innocent*, and is a Principle of *mine*, I cannot imagine. One ought to have a regard to Chriſtian *Morals*, as well as Chriſtian *Principles*; and I look upon ſuch a Behaviour as he has ſhewn *here*, and in ſome *other* Parts of this Debate, to be a great *Violation* of them. Exam. p. 10.

I do not indeed entertain any great Hopes, that it will appear to the Gentleman *himſelf*; that he wrote this, before he had well conſidered the Matter; (he has given ſuch Specimens of ſtrong Prejudice, and a Readineſs to juſtify almoſt every thing right or wrong, as leave little room to expect this from him) but every *impartial Reader* muſt be ſatisfied, that as all his Accuſations of *Self-Contradictions*, &c. were ſupported *by* nothing but his own Miſrepreſentations, *&c.* ſo they are vaniſhed *into nothing*. P. 6.

There

There are only one or two things more, I would obſerve, before we leave this Part of his Examination.

Having taken notice of my obſerving, that, ſuppoſing the *Author* had gone ſo far as to inſinuate or aſſert, that for Men to ſeparate from a ſound Part of the Church of Chriſt, with which they might communicate without Sin, is in effect, to ſeparate, or cut themſelves off from the whole Church, *this* is no more than has been often ſaid,
P. 12. and ſome think proved by *others*; and that ſeveral Quotations are put in the Margin relating to this Matter, he aſks with ſome Vehemence, *What ſuch a Way of Reaſoning amounts to?*

To which I anſwer, that it was not intended for any way of Reaſoning *at all*; but merely to abate the Prejudices ſome ſeemed to have conceived againſt the *Author* of the *Trial*, as if he had aſſerted, or inſinuated a Thing, which no Divine of a good Character and Reputation, had ever done before. To this Notion Mr. *M.* gave occaſion, by expreſſing ſo much *Surprize*, *Wonder*, &c. upon finding *ſuch a Paragraph* drop from *his* Pen, which contained in it ſo *very dangerous an Expreſſion*.

For this only purpoſe, were the ſeveral Paſſages cited in the Remarks here and afterwards, from the Writings of ſome of the greateſt, moſt learned, and beſt Men this Church ever was bleſſed with; and many of them the moſt eminent for
Exam. p. 20. univerſal *Charity* and *Moderation*; who yet did not think there was reaſonable and ſufficient Grounds to *juſtify this Separation*. Mr. *M.* may pleaſe to be informed, that I am not uſed any more than himſelf, to *offer* or *take Authorities* for *Reaſons*. If he had conſidered *this*, it would have
P. 12, 13. ſaved him the Trouble of writing *two* whole Pages to no purpoſe in the World; unleſs it were to ſhew his

his *Quixotiſm* in fighting with the Giants, and Enemies that had no Exiſtence but in his own *Imagination*.

Little better is what he ſays on my recommending it to him, to Anſwer the *London-Caſes*: " It P. 14.
" would be *admirable* indeed, ſays he, if the
" Clergy of the Eſtabliſhed Church [or as he P. 13.
" *wittily* expreſſes it elſewhere, *the* poor *Curates*
" and *Rectors*, Great Mens *Chaplains* and *Digni-*
" *fied Clergymen*] ſhould *approve* of the Separa-
" tion, *&c.*" Why, did I lay any Streſs upon their *Authority* in this Caſe? As they did not, and (as he moſt acutely *intimates*) could not think the Diſſenters *blameleſs* in their Separation, without *condemning* themſelves, I only hinted it would be a proper Employment for the Gentleman, to try if he could convince the World, that the *Schiſm* Exam.
does not lie on the Side of the *Diſſenters*, but of P. 13.
the Church of *England*. And I really wonder he ſhould ſeem to take *this* Motion ſo ill from me: He might *here* diſplay his wonderful Talents to much greater Advantage, than by entering the Liſts with one he deſpiſes ſo much—a Curate—even the *Curate* of *Maidſtone*; who had afforded him but a *Word* or two to diſpute about.

But there is one thing more I cannot omit obſerving; *viz.* that as *admirable* as it would be to expect the *Clergy* of the *Eſtabliſhment*, ſhould *approve* of the *Separation*, his *whole Quarrel* with the Author of the *Trial*, is grounded on little, or nothing elſe, but his laying the *Blame* of the *Separation* on the *Diſſenters*, and not being willing to *retract ſo harſh an Aſſertion*. If he had but done this *little* thing, he might have continued quiet in his *Curacy*, and Mr. *M.* would be his *reſpectful humble Servant*.

Here I may properly take notice of what he ſays of the *Notion* I *ſeem* to have formed of the Character of a peaceable Non-conformiſt Miniſter,
P. 34. *viz.* That he ſhould make no Reply to any thing the Clergy may think fit to *ſay* or *print* againſt Diſſenters, *&c.* Now this is not *my* Notion of the Matter; where it *differs* need not be mentioned. But let the *true Character* of a *moderate*, &c. Diſſenting Miniſter be what it will, it will ſcarce be allowed that *he* is one of the Number: The *catching at Occaſions of Offence*; the *ſeeking a Quarrel* againſt a Neighbour, who always, in a Courſe of many Years, had been obſerved to behave with much Temper and Moderation towards Diſſenters—the animadverting upon a ſhort Paragraph in a *nameleſs* Book, not wrote againſt Diſſenters,—and that in ſuch a *Manner*, and with ſuch *Circumſtances*, as it appears Mr. *M.* has done in this Caſe, ſeems not very agreeable to any Pretences to Charity and Moderation. If it be, the *Difference* cannot be great between one ſort of *Diſſenting Miniſters* and another; but it may well be ſaid, that thoſe *who call themſelves ſober*, and *moderate*, and *charitable*, are really no better than ſuch as paſs under *another* Character. But I know better things of *ſome* of them; and many *more* there doubtleſs are, who would not have acted like Mr. *M.* upon ſuch an *Occaſion*.

He ſays, that I *intimate broadly enough* my Reſentment
P. 21. *of his having any thing to do with the Controverſy*. For the Truth of *this* Repreſentation, I need only refer to *p.* 29. of the *Remarks*. " If " there were any thing in his [the *Author* of the " *Trial*'s] Book, which *he*, Mr. *M.* or others " thought not true, no *doubt*, *they had a Right to* " *ſhew it to the World.* —— *Whoever writes and* " *publiſhes any thing apprehended to be falſe*, may—

" be

" be *anſwered* by any one who is able to con-
" vince the World of it; provided it be done
" in a fair and proper Manner. What is *pub-*
" *liſhed* on one Side of a *Queſtion*, may very
" reaſonably be as publickly anſwered on the
" other.——The *Book* being made *Publick* might
" be as *publickly anſwered.*" Does *this* look like P. 31.
a *broad Intimation* that I reſented his having *any thing to do with the Controverſy?* All I reſented was, his carrying it on in the *Manner* he thought fit to do. This may be thought not to deſerve *ſo much* notice (though it is an Inaccuracy even Rem.
in point of *Truth*) but I was the more willing to P. 27.
obſerve it, becauſe, it may ſerve as a *rare Sample* of the *Gentleman*'s great *Fairneſs* and *Exactneſs* in repreſenting.

What he offers in Defence of his *Conduct* with regard to the *two Gentleman concerned in the Account*, comes next to be conſidered.

He *ſhrapes* me for blaming him *as taking fire ſo* P. 22.
immediately as I would repreſent him doing, upon hearing the Sermon: He was not *ſo hot* (he ſays) *as I would perſuade the Reader*; as appears by his *deferring* taking notice of what offended him for ſome Months.

Now it happens, that the moſt *I* intimate is, his *taking fire immediately*; which is very *conſiſtent* with his not giving vent to his Reſentment for a conſiderable Time. This is ſcarce any thing more than his *own* Expreſſion of being SURPRIZ'D *to hear the Diſſenters queſtion'd*, and *reſolving*, upon it, to *enter into a Converſation with the Preacher*, intimates in the *Account*. I ſay nothing of the *Degree* of the *Gentleman*'s Heat ——whether he was *ſo hot*, or *greatly heated*——or any thing like it; though methinks his reaſoning is not ſo perfectly clear in this Matter; for when ſo much time had intervened, and yet he was not *cool* enough to paſs

over the Thing that offended him, but he *put the Preacher* into his *Pamphlet*, and ſcattered his Diſlike of his Sermon over the *whole* Nation, it looks as if, he were *more heated* than he is willing to own. But it is not worth *my* contending about; and I ſuppoſe, the *Reader* will think the whole Paſſage might have eſcaped *his* Cenſure, unleſs he could have found ſome greater Faults in it, than this, and calling the Paſſage in the Sermon an *incidental* thing.

As to the *other Gentleman*, he ſays, that the *Evidence* he had, and the *Proof* he could make of his being the *Author* of the *Trial*, was ſo *great*, that "it did not once enter into his Thoughts, "before the Publication, that any Perſon, even "the *Author* himſelf, would be likely to lay "Blame to him for *ſetting his Name in his Pam-* "*phlet*."

Exam. p. 25.

But, notwithſtanding the imagined Clearneſs of his Proof, might he not poſſibly have been *miſtaken*, and aſcribe the Book to the *wrong* Perſon, as is very common in *ſuch* Caſes? One part of his Evidence, I am ſure, will not always ſtand the Teſt. He ſays, "The *Bookſeller* in *London* was "not at all reſtrained from mentioning the *Au-* "*thor*'s Name, but did it with all Readineſs." But might not the *Bookſeller* himſelf be ignorant of the *true Author?* Mr. *M. knows one* thing, *viz.* that a Perſon's *publiſhing* a MS. [ſuppoſe *a Letter*, or *part* of a Letter] is no Proof of his being the *Writer* of it; and, though he is, without doubt, a *Gentleman* of great *Sagacity* and *Induſtry* too in making ſuch Diſcoveries, yet that he may not think himſelf *Infallible*, I will tell him *another* thing of which I am able to make *full Proof*, viz. that *he* ſeems to intimate a *certain Perſon* to be the *Author* of many *Contradictions*, *Inſinuations*, *Reflections*, &c. who (where his Accuſations as *well proved*

proved as they are *confidently made*) was *not* the *Author* of them. But (being willing to requite any Favour done me) I ſhall *take no* Advantage of his *Blunder* here, becauſe I am ſenſible he blunders in the *dark*, (as Men uſually do) and cannot help it. Exam. P. 10.

He pretends, that he did not apprehend any Blame could accrue to *him* for ſetting the *Author's Name* in *his* Pamphlet, " becauſe the Thing was " ſo generally known to be his—the *Clerk of the* " *Pariſh* had Copies to diſpoſe of—and he *himſelf* " was no way backward to own it to any of his " *Acquaintance*." But *all* theſe poor *Subterfuges* and *Palliations* are anſwered by *one* obvious Remark, *viz.* that, if the *Author* had been willing to have his Name *publiſhed in Print*, he could have done it *himſelf*; and that he might *not be backward* to own his being the *Author* of the *Trial* to his *Friends* and *Acquaintance*, and yet be *very backward* to conſent to have his *Name* publiſhed as ſuch, in publick *News-Papers*, and toſſed about the *Kingdom* in " *An Account of a Controverſy* be- " tween *Him* and this *Controverſy-Maker*."

He confeſſes, that he *promiſed* not to publiſh the *Author's Letters*. I was greatly pleaſed to ſee this *Acknowledgment* in the *Pamphlet*. For, though I thought myſelf pretty ſure of my hand, yet, when I read in his *Title-page* [which I have much greater Reaſon to complain of, than he has of *mine*] the Words, FALSE *and Partial*, &c. I began to think I was to be charged with *Falſe Facts*, as well as *weak Reaſoning*; and could not help ſuſpecting that *this*, as well as what he ſlips over ſo cunningly, was to be ſet out as ſomething *worſe* than a worthy Piece of *Apochryphal* Hiſtory. O! that Word *Apochryphal* has ſometimes done better Service to a Diſſenting Teacher. Exam. P. 36.

But he *did promiſe*, he ſays, and is ſo good as to tell in what *Manner*, and to *whom*, the *Promiſe* was P. 25.

was made: which is all *very true*; but, to make his Account compleat, I will beg leave to add the *Reaſon* of the *Author*'s deſiring a *Neighbour-Clergyman*'s undertaking *this* Office.—It was no other than his Unwillingneſs to be *catched* writing *another Letter* to *ſuch* a worthy Correſpondent. I can produce *clear Proof* of this too, if he pleaſe to call for it.

How he made good his *Promiſe*, is another Queſtion: If it ſhould be inſiſted on, that *publiſhing* the *full Effect*, *and greater part of the Words*, *of a Letter*, is publiſhing *a Letter*, and conſequently that he did *not* perform all that was *aſked* and *promiſed*, I believe Mr. *M.* would be troubled to acquit himſelf of the Charge brought againſt him.

Rem p. 24. He ſays indeed, in his *Defence*, that, "being "engaged in an *Epiſtolary* Debate, he had a "Right to *extract* from the *Letters* whatever Paſ-"ſage he thought fit to reflect on." If an *Epiſtolary Debate* were, on both ſides, *agreed* to be carried on in order to be publiſhed, there would be ſomething in what he ſays; but, as the Circumſtances of this Caſe are, it is a *mere Evaſion*. The Thing the *Author* of the *Trial* and his Friends complain of is, his *firſt* engaging him in this *private epiſtolary Debate*, and then, without his Leave, *publickly* commenting on, and expoſing what he knew was ſent him only for his *own* Satisfaction.

This is a *Conduct* not like to be thought *excuſable* by any one, *who is not under the ſtrong Influence*
P. 24. *of Prejudice and Bigotry:* It cannot ſurely be any *great Honour* to him; or give any great Reaſon to
P. 39. mind what he afterwards (with a moſt aſſuming Air) *declares on his Honour*.

My only farther Concern with this *Honourable* Gentleman, is to account with him for *ſome* (that is, the *principal* and moſt *injurious*) of the Inſtances of *Inaccuracies*, &c. charged on the *Remarks*.

And

And if it appear, that in order *to expoſe and blacken me*, he has here *denied*, or *prevaricated* in, the cleareſt and moſt evident *Facts*, and perverted the *plaineſt* and moſt *innocent Words*, I hope the *Reader* will do me the Juſtice not to believe *all* that *this Man ſays or writes* in *other* Parts of his Book.

He ſuppoſes, that " I will be inclined to quar- P. 24.
" rel with him for making ſo many *Extracts* out
" of the *Remarks*; which it will be no *great Ho-*
" *nour* to me for the World to ſee." But it is a great Satisfaction to me, that I am not in the Caſe of the *Author* of the *Trial:* He can make no *Extracts* from any *Writings* of mine, but what may be and are already ſeen without *his* Comments; and I fear no *Diſhonour* from them as they ſtand in *my* Pamphlet, however he may repreſent them in *his*. So that, if I am inclined *to quarrel with him at all*, it is not for *making Extracts* from the *Remarks*; (why ſhould I, when they are *already publiſhed* to the World?) but for not making his Extracts *fairly*, or putting his *own abuſive Senſes* upon *my* Words. And I am ready to think, that the *Reader*, before he *comes to the End of theſe Papers*, will be convinced, that Mr. *M.*'s *Extracts* from the *Remarks* reflect no ſort of *Diſhonour* upon any body but *Himſelf*. But to proceed to his *Liſt*.

He ſets it down as an *Inaccuracy*, that I ſay Rem. p29.
" he conſiders the *Quakers* as Members of the
" *Church of Chriſt*; whereas (he pretends) the
" Truth is, he neither *affirmed* or *denied* them ſo
" to be." Now here I will only produce his own Words in the *Account*, and leave it to any one to judge between us. " Many Writers of the *Eſta-* P. 14.
" *bliſhed Communion* have contended that the
" Church of *Rome* is a true Church, and ſo *Pa-*
" *piſts* not to be excluded from the Commu-
" nion of *Chriſtians*. And if ſo, (*i. e.* if *Papiſts*
" are not to be excluded) *I cannot but think* it
" would

" would be as unreaſonable to pronounce, even of " the *Quakers*, that they are out of the Com- " munion of Chriſt's Church." It certainly *is ſo*; we do *not* exclude *Papiſts*, and he *infers* from thence, that it is *unreaſonable* to *exclude the Quakers*; or he ſays nothing.

In the ſame Page, the *Remarker* is accuſed of another *Inaccuracy* for affirming, " Mr. *M.* con- " tends, that the *Words* of the *Trial* are of a *doubt-* " *ful* Meaning; whereas he contended, on the " other hand, that the *Senſe* of the Words is not " at all doubtful." Here, I am ſure, he has
P. 9. practiſed what he groundleſsly charges on me: He has *ſhifted and changed the Terms*, and thrown Duſt in the Reader's Eyes to make him believe a Thing he can ſcarce believe *himſelf*. For, his *Anſwer* is, he contended, that the SENSE of the Words is not at all doubtful; when it is viſible to every Reader, I am ſpeaking of the WORDS, not
Account, what *he* calls the *Senſe* of them. But here too I
P. 27. appeal to his *own* Words in the *Account*. " If, " *inſtead* of the Communion of *Chriſt's Church*, " you had WRITTEN the Communion of the " *Church of England*, there would have been NO " UNCERTAINTY as to your MEANING." If this do not imply, that *as it is* NOW WRITTEN, there is *ſome* UNCERTAINTY, I can only ſay, *Words* have no *meaning* at all. This is worſe than a *Witticiſm*, and ſhews that Mr. *M.* can run into palpable *Contradictions*, and make *himſelf ridiculous* as well as his *Neighbours*.

The next *Inaccuracy* I ſhall take notice of is—
Exam. that I ſay " he acknowledges *he was ſatisfied from*
P. 31. " *the Beginning*, that the *Author* of the *Trial* had " no *ſuch* Meaning as he charged upon his " Words." As to this alſo, let his own Words determine the Matter. " I did not expect *from* " *the beginning*, that you would *abide by this Con-* " *ſequence*."

" *ſequence.*" I ſee nothing in his referring to his *firſt* Letter, and all that *follows*, to prove the leaſt *Inaccuracy* on *my* Words; it is indeed all over *colluſive* and *evaſive*. But what he adds, in the Cloſe, is a *Maſter-piece*. " I might (*he ſays*) " have conſidered, that there is ſome difference " between ſaying he did not expect the *Writer* of " the *Trial*, would *abide* by (i. e. *eſpouſe* and *de-* " *fend* whether in *writing* or *print*) the *Conſequence* " which followed from his Words, and ſaying, " *he was ſatisfied he had no ſuch Meaning*; for a " Man may not think fit *publickly* to defend every " Principle he may *inwardly* believe." *This*, I look upon as another *groundleſs Reflection* upon the *Author* of the *Trial*; for it too *broadly intimates* a Charge of the *ſame* Kind he had brought before;— that though he might at firſt inſinuate and *inwardly* believe the Diſſenters are *out of the Communion of Chriſt's Church*, yet he might not think fit *publickly* to defend *that* Principle. The *Gentleman* deſires, that what he writes in this *Examination*, may not be thought *to proceed from any Diſſatisfaction* to the *Author* of the *Trial*: But I had rather have him publickly own his Diſaffection to *me*, than give me a parcel of fine *Words*, and *uſe* me in *ſuch* a manner.

His very next Inſtance of *Inaccuracy* is of the *ſame* Kind: The Thing complained of is, that I ſay " he owned the *Author* had, *in a frank and* P. 32. " *ingenuous Manner*, removed the *Uncertainty* as " to his Meaning:" To which he anſwers, that " he no where ſaid this, but rather complains on " the contrary, that he was *backward* to declare " himſelf, and that it was *drawn* from him with " Difficulty." But he might, and perhaps would have ſpared *this* Inſtance, had it not been for the Pleaſure of *another Slur* on the Author. For I did not ſay, that Mr. *M.* owns, *it was in a frank*

and ingenuous Manner, that the *Author* of the *Trial* removed the Uncertainty in his Words, but only that he *owns* he did *remove the Uncertainty*; which I (for my *own* Part) ſpoke of, as done in a *frank and ingenuous Manner*. This the very *pointing* and *marking the Words in Italick Characters*, ſhews to be my unqueſtionable Meaning. There was *no* occaſion therefore given by *me*, for the *Gentleman's courtly Reflection*, viz. that the *Author* did *not deal with him in a frank and ingenuous Manner*. The World, however, I believe, is pretty well ſatisfied, that he ſhewed himſelf *too frank and ingenuous*, in writing *any* Letters, or having *any* thing *to do* with *ſuch a Man as he*; a Man of *much Caution* would have acted in ſuch a Manner, as not to have his Name put into *an Account of a Controverſy*, &c.

Under *this* Inſtance of *Inaccuracy*, after reciting a Paſſage produced in the *Remarks*, in which he endeavoured to *impoſe and blacken* the main Body of the *Clergy* of *England*, inſtead of attempting to *prove* the Charge, (*as he was called upon to do*) he, in a high Tone, *renews* and *repeats* it——

Exam. p. 33. "It is a thing *every body knows* already——it is "ſuch a Piece of *Quixotiſm* to challenge me to "*prove* it, as I could by no means have ex-"pected, *&c.*"

But how *ludicrouſly* ſoever he may think fit to treat the Matter, I muſt *ſeriouſly* aſk, whether every body does indeed *know*, that *the Rage he ſpeaks of*, at the Period referred to, was "*ſtirred up in great* "*Meaſure by the Influence* of the CLERGY, "with whom it was FASHIONABLE (com-"mon or cuſtomary) to pour out *Invectives* a-"gainſt the *Sectaries*; or, as the Phraſe at that "time was, the *Phanaticks*, &c." That *many* a Clergyman in *England* did, at that time, too much miſbehave himſelf, and expreſs too great *Bitterneſs*

and

and *Uncharitableneſs* towards *Diſſenters*, (and even towards vaſt Numbers of *worthy Men* both of the *Clergy* and *Laity*, who were not Favourers of *Diſſenters*, as ſuch) is not deny'd: And it would be ſtrange, if among ſo great a Body of Men, there ſhould not be *ſome* found at all times, who act in a manner unworthy of their Character. But will *this* juſtify Mr. *M.* in charging *ſuch* a Conduct on the *Body of* the CLERGY *in general*—the CLERGY in *the Lump*—or the *main Body* of the CLERGY of *England?* This is juſt like his Treatment of the *Paragraph*; applying to *all*, what is ſaid of *ſome* only.

He ſeems to appeal to the *Curate* himſelf for the Truth of his groundleſs *Invective*, as being *a Perſon* (he ſuppoſes) *at* that time of *ſufficient Standing in the World*, to be an *Obſerver of publick Occurrences*; or, at leaſt wonders, that *he* ſhould have any doubt about the Truth of it. Whether he be of the *Standing in the World* Mr. *M.* is pleaſed to imagine, or not, is no great matter; it is *ſufficient*, that he can truly affirm, he does *not know* any thing to juſtify *ſo falſe and partial a Repreſentation*; on the contrary, he has very good reaſon to *believe*, that *great Numbers*, nay the *main Body*, and *greater part of the Clergy*, at *that* time, were Men of *Temper*, *Charity* and *Moderation*, and *far from uſing their Influence to ſtir up the People to Rage and Violence*; tho' they were no Favourers of *Diſſenters*; as *ſome* of them were repreſented to be, by ſeveral of their *warmer* Brethren. The *Aſperſion* Mr. *M.* inſinuates upon ſo *venerable a Body of Men*, may (in his *own* polite Language) be called *Candor and Charity with a Vengeance*; for nothing ſurely can be farther from *true* Candour and Charity, than to impute the Miſ-conduct of *ſome* to the *whole Order*, and that with the wildeſt Vehemence, and unkindeſt Aggravations. So that I may here Exam. P. 33.

Exam. p. 26. very fitly return him his own Compliment: "If it "be ſuppoſed, that I have, in any degree, been "wanting in Candour and Charity, the *Examiner* "ſhould have been the *laſt Man* in the World to "tax me with it; the Rebuke would have come "with a much better Grace from any other quar- "ter, than from this *worthy Preſbyterian Teacher* "at *Maidſtone* in *Kent*."

But he goes on to tax me for ſaying, that the *Inhabitants* of *this* Town were in ſo *quiet a State*, that "they heard nothing, all that while, of Diſ- "ſenters branded with publick Marks of Infamy

P. 33. "——If ſo, *he adds*, they were quiet indeed; as "quiet as Men in a *deep Sleep*; and they had a "long *Nap* of it too [this is a very *delicate* "*Flower* indeed, and the *Examiner* I dare ſay, "would greatly repine, if I ſhould happen to over- "look it] if they did not *once awake*, all the "while the *Schiſm-Bill* was preparing and paſſing." But was this ſame wicked *Schiſm-Bill prepared* or *paſſed* at *Maidſtone?* If not; what is all this *idle Stuff* to the purpoſe, unleſs it be to make the *Writer* quite *ridiculous?*

That the Reader may the better judge of it, I will confront theſe *delicate* Reflections, with the very Words of the *Remarks*. "Whatever *tumultuous* do- "ings there might be in ſome *other* Parts, there "was nothing of *this* kind at *Maidſtone*—They "*heard* nothing of Diſſenters branded with *Marks* "*of Infamy*—ſaw no Inſults on their *Perſons*,—or "*demoliſhing* their *Places of Worſhip there*." Now a Man of *very moderate Capacities*, not diſpoſed to cavil at the plaineſt Words, *could not avoid ſeeing*, that I was ſpeaking of the *general Temper* and Behaviour of the *Inhabitants of this Town*, at the Time he refers to, without any View to *publick* Tranſactions. I was ſo weak as to ſuppoſe, that by *Marks of Infamy* with which, he ſaid *Diſſenters*

were

were then publickly branded, was meant the *ſame* with *Invectives againſt the Sectaries and Phanaticks*, &c. And I had ſome reaſon to ſay, that they *heard nothing of all this at Maidſtone*; the *Clergy* and *People* there are ſaid to have been very remarkable for their *Moderation* towards *Diſſenters*; and I heartily wiſh they may always continue ſo; notwithſtanding Mr. *M.*'s Endeavour to brand me with the Mark of an uncharitable *Bigot*, and a bitter Enemy to Diſſenters.

He ſeems very *angry*, and in ſome ſort of *Paſſion*, upon *reading* a few Words in the *Remarks*, which he ſuppoſes to *inſinuate* an *Aſperſion* upon him—*that he has either broken, or is likely to break, the Peace of this Place.* Now I am a very plain Man, (whatever he imagines) and will tell him the *plain Truth:* I did apprehend that the *Methods* he has taken, are not at all *likely to promote Peace* and *Quiet*, but have a *natural Tendency* to *ſour* and *imbitter* the People *againſt one another*. This is *my* real Opinion; and, if it happen to *offend the* Gentleman, *I cannot help it*. I ſhall, however, rejoice with all my Heart to find *my* Fears in this Matter, as *groundleſs*, as is *his* charging them with proceeding from *want of Candour* and *Charity*. P. 33.

As to what he ſays in the Page *before*—that "I "loudly exclaim againſt him as attempting to ex- "poſe the *Author* of the *Trial* in print, and ſet "his Neighbours and Pariſhioners againſt him, "that his Preaching may be vain, and their "Faith alſo vain," it muſt have much the ſame Anſwer, *viz.* that his *writing* and *publiſhing* as he has done, naturally tends to ſet his *Neighbours* and *Pariſhioners* againſt him, *&c.* That he did not *intend* ſo much Prejudice to him, or to hinder the Succeſs of his Labours, I charitably hope and believe; but that, in fact, his Management has prejudiced a great many of the People againſt their Miniſter, P. 32.

Miniſter, *who has the Rule over them by the Laws of this Realm*, is a Matter capable of too much Evidence: Or there would not be ſo many to be met with, who ſcruple not to ſay, they *ſhall not like Mr. W. again as long as they live.* The raiſing *ſuch* Prejudices againſt a Clergyman, is not like to forward the Succeſs of his Miniſtry among his People, but may be a Means of rendering *his Preaching*, and *their Faith alſo vain.*

The next Inſtance of *Inaccuracy* I ſhall obſerve, is ſcarce worth mentioning, but that the *Gentleman* ſeems to lay a great Streſs upon it. He ſays, "I
P. 38. "make him to have uſed *a Word*, which was not "his, but complained of as ſet down by the Au- "thor of the *Trial* inſtead of that which was uſed "by him"—that is *Require*, inſtead of *call upon.* Here I might juſtly plead, that the Words [*in his own way of ſpeaking*] do not neceſſarily require what is added, to refer to the *preciſe Words he uſes*, but may well enough be underſtood to *allude* to his
P. 18, 19, 20. *Cuſtom* or *Uſage* all through the *Account* of *inſiſting* on the *Proof* of what is offered by the *Author* of the *Trial.* But I will ſubmit to the courteous and candid *Examiner*'s Cenſure, and freely own it to be, if not an *Inaccuracy*, at leaſt, a ſort of *Inadvertency*—being owing entirely to the want of looking on *the Account* when I wrote the bad Word *Require*, inſtead of *calling upon.* It ſeems the inaccurate *Author* of the *Trial* was guilty of the ſame Fault; and, if the *Examiner* had let it paſs in *me*, as well as *him*, without ſo ſevere an Animadverſion, or one Word about *modeſt Aſſurance*, the World would have thought it as great an Evidence of his *Decency*, *Candour*, and *Charity*, as the Expreſſions he uſes on this trifling Occaſion. However, having owned it to be an Inaccuracy, I hope, as to this matter, *my Peace is made with the Gentleman*; but as to the *three* Inſtances I have reſerved

to

to the laſt, we are like to have a much *greater Difference*, and one not ſo eaſy to be reconciled.

In the *firſt* of them, he accuſes me of no leſs than an *Inaccuracy* or *Defect* in point of *Truth* and *Juſtice*—as " not being aſhamed in the Title of the " Remarks, to publiſh a *manifeſt Calumny*, as tho' " he had caſt *groundleſs Aſperſions* and *Reflections* on " the Author of the *Trial*—And he cloſes the " Charge with this ſtinging Reflection—a *Calum-* " *ny* ſo viſible to every one that reads the Account, " that I am (ſays he) amazed the *Remarker*, how " little ſoever he regards my Reputation, ſhould " have no more Concern for his *own*, than to pub- " liſh ſuch a *Slander*." This is a *home Thruſt* indeed, and ſtabs a Man in the very *Vitals* of his Character. If I have given *real* and *juſt* Occaſion for *ſuch* Language, I muſt own myſelf unworthy of the *Character* of a *Chriſtian Miniſter*, and a Clergyman of the Church of *England*; though it is *my Glory* and *Crown of Rejoicing*, and what (if I know my own Heart) I would not part with for the moſt magnificent Titles, and the *peculiar Treaſures of Kings and Provinces*. It cannot but raiſe ſome *Indignation in my Breaſt*, to be ſpoken of in ſo *ſhocking* a Manner; and I can ſcarce forbear ſaying, as one of Mr. *M.*'s *warm Brethren* once did to *another* of them—" If this Charge of Calumny " and Slander be *true*, it is Pity I ſhould go into " a Pulpit again; but if it be falſe, it is not fit " that ſuch an Accuſer of his Brother ſhould."

To determine this Matter, I deſire the Reader to conſider, that the *Account* of a Controverſy, *&c.* (the Circumſtances of the Caſe conſidered) ſeems to be all over a *caſting Aſperſions and Reflections on the Author of the Trial*. He indeed ſays, it is viſible *to every* one, that he has *not* done *this*; but I can tell him, upon good Authority, that it was not *viſible* to the *Author himſelf*; nor is it viſible to *any*

Friend

Friend of the Author's, that the repreſenting him to the World, in the Manner he has done, *is not caſting Aſperſions and Reflections* upon him. Let the candid Reader turn to *p.* 22, 23. where he will find him ſet out as ſaying Things in his Letter ſo falſe and untrue, that Mr. *M.* profeſſes himſelf *amazed to ſee ſuch Aſſertions.* In *p.* 7. he accuſes him of *writing* in a Manner that *ſavours little of that Virtue*, Charity, *with the Want of which he accuſes Mr. Wh.* which is, at once, repreſenting him as both an *uncharitable* and *inconſiſtent* Writer. He broadly intimates, that he is not the Man he took him for—tells him that the Paragraph *appeared to him quite contrary to the Notion he had entertained of him*—and *wonders* it ſhould *drop from his Pen.* The 24th and 25th Pages, are well fraught with Expreſſions, that may juſtly be called *Aſperſions* and *Reflections* of one kind or other. Even while he is ſaying Things which he would have, perhaps, taken as a *Compliment* to the *Author*, he caſts a *ſevere Reflection* upon him. Thus *p.* 7. he intimates that the Paragraph is *unworthy* of a Gentleman of *good Senſe*, and a *ſedate* Temper—and fit to proceed only from a Perſon of little *Judgment* and leſs *Charity.* This is too *broadly intimating* what *Character* he ſuppoſes a Man to *deſerve*, who *is* the Author of it.

If we go no farther, it is viſible that a Perſon who writes *of* and *to* another in *this Manner*, may, with a great deal of *Truth*, be ſaid to *caſt Aſperſions and Reflections upon him.* And an impartial Reader will be apt to think *this* Man muſt have a good Stock of that *modeſt Aſſurance* he talks of, to *deny* a Thing ſo *clear* and *evident*, and accuſe me of *Calumny* and *Slander*, for *undertaking* to vindicate the Author from *his Aſperſions* and *Reflections*, in the *Title of the Remarks.* But there is one thing *behind*, that will preſently, and at firſt ſight, enable

ble *any* Reader (whether *impartial* or otherwiſe) to determine whether the *Writer* of the *Remarks*, or Mr. *M.* be guilty of *Slander* and *Calumny*.

That it is an *Aſperſion* and *Reflection* on any Man, to be repreſented to the World, as uſing EVASIONS, COLLUSION, and ARTIFICE, (that is, *Tricks*, *Double-dealing*, *cunning Fetches*, and *crafty Devices*) in *his Defence*, need not to be proved: It is eſteemed a Matter of very *great Infamy*, to betake one's ſelf to *ſuch* Methods in the common Concerns of Life, or in a Court of Juſtice or Equity, though never ſo great Advantages are to be gained by them. Let the Reader then turn to Mr. *M.*'s *Account of a Controverſy*, p. 11. "You "(the *Author* of the *Trial*) would conceive a very "poor Notion of my Judgment, if I ſhould mi- "ſtake MERE EVASIONS for ſolid Argu- "ments." He himſelf ſeems to think *this* ſomewhat of a Reflection, when he afterwards calls it an *uncourtly* Phraſe; but as uncourtly as it ſeemed, he tells him very briſkly he would *juſtify* it, or prove it upon him. See next *p.* 15. "What, Sir, "can be the Deſign of theſe Expreſſions? Can it "be any other than COLLUSION, and an AR- "TIFICE to hide your *real* Meaning?" He ſays "He is ſure this was one of the *worſt* Reflections Exam. "caſt upon the Author in the Courſe of his Let- p. 35. "ters;" and what *worſe* could he caſt upon him, unleſs he had called him—what I care not to mention?

He tells me, "the *Prelate* I referred to, eſteem- P. 26. "ed it a vaſtly more criminal Thing to be *abu-* "*ſed by a certain Doctor in much the ſame Way I* "*have taken with him*, than the publickly fixing "a nameleſs Book upon a Man." But the Gentleman, I find, has forgot the true State of the Caſe, and the Ground of the *good Biſhop*'s greater Complaint againſt the *Doctor:* He did not complain for

being treated in the Way *he* is treated in the *Remarks*; (as he injuriouſly repreſents it) but for being uſed in the very *ſame* Manner *he himſelf* has uſed the *Author* of the *Trial* in his *Account of a Controverſy* with him; *viz.* the *Doctor*'s accuſing him of making Uſe of an EVASIVE and EQUIVOCAL way of writing, and having ſeemed to have learned this *bad Way* of a *Jeſuit*. This, the Biſhop calls *caſting a Load of Infamy* upon him; and tho' *this* Part of the *Doctor*'s Behaviour muſt be owned to be much worſe than fixing a nameleſs Book upon a Man, yet what Advantage the obſerving it can be to Mr. *M.* when he has copied the *Doctor*'s Practice in *both* Inſtances, is hard to diſcover.

Shape's 2d Letter, and Biſhop's Anſwer.

When Mr. *M.* ſuggeſts (as he does) in the next Words, that *bad as it is*, I have vouched for the Truth of *this* Charge on the *Author* of the *Trial*, this is only a *Repetition* of his former *Aſperſion* and *Reflection*; grounded upon nothing but a manifeſt Perverſion of the Words; which (though not ſufficiently guarded againſt the Attacks of *ſuch* a Writer) afford no Foundation for the injurious Conſtruction he makes of them; much leſs, for his uſing the Author in ſo very ſhameful a Manner. The *Author*'s ſaying in his *Letter*, and my repeating it in the *Remarks*, that the *Preſbyterians* are not *once mentioned* in the *Trial*, gives no Ground to charge him with an Inſinuation that *none* of them were intended, and that he muſt mean *this* or nothing. It is to me ſtill evident enough, that he did mean *ſomething*, *viz.* that Mr. *M.* being a *Preſbyterian*, had the leſs Reaſon to call upon him as he did, becauſe the *Preſbyterians* (for whom alone he then thought he was concerned) were not once mentioned in the Pamphlet; and yet, it is as evident, he did not intend to ſay *all* that this *acute* Gentleman would preſs out of his Words; becauſe he only intimates, that he had *other* Denominations of Diſſenters

Diſſenters *particularly* in his View; in *general* he had *ſome* among *all ſorts* of Diſſenters *in View*, (and conſequently *ſome* among the *Preſbyterians*) but *more particularly* the Diſſenters, who are *by Name* mentioned in the *Trial*.

This is all the Ground the *Examiner* has, for charging the *Author* of the *Trial* with the *foulеſt Things* he could have named; and endeavouring to bring *me* for a *Voucher* that, *bad as it is*, he had ſufficient Reaſon to continue his Charge. So that the Matter, in ſhort, muſt ſtand thus. Mr. *M.* does not deny his *accuſing* the Author of *Evaſions*, *Colluſion*, and *Artifice*, nor pretend that they are *not Aſperſions* or *Reflections*; and muſt conſequently admit, that the *Title-page* of the *Remarks* ſtands perfectly clear of the Imputations of *Calumny* and *Slander* in undertaking to vindicate the Author from theſe Aſperſions, *&c.* unleſs they are caſt on him upon *good* Grounds. I thought, and ſtill think, they are *groundleſs*; but, ſhould I happen to be miſtaken, I appeal to the whole World, whether it would juſtify or excuſe his repreſenting me in the moſt aggravating Language, as publiſhing a *viſible Calumny* and *Slander* againſt him in the *Title-page* of the *Remarks*. I am however ſo well ſatisfied that Mr. *M.*'s Charges of *Colluſion* and *Artifice* are *groundleſs*, that I will venture to promiſe to confeſs myſelf guilty of what he accuſes me, when he has proved that *this* and his many other *Aſperſions* and *Reflections* on the *Author* are *well-grounded*: but, till that is done, he muſt, with all equal Judges, take the reproachful Words of *Calumniator* and *Slanderer to himſelf*.

He ſets it down as another Inaccuracy, that I ſay, "it can proceed from nothing but an high "Degree of *Bigotry* and *Prejudice* in Diſſenters, "to think with Averſion of returning into the "Communion of the Church of *England*." To Exam. p. 30.

this I give this plain Anſwer, (by which the Reader will ſee how much he *wire-draws my Words*, in order to brand me as an Enemy to all Diſſenters) *viz.* That thinking with Averſion of returning, *&c.* I apprehended, implied, that ſuch Perſons were ſo unreaſonably fixed and determined in their Courſe of Separation, as to refuſe to try and examine, or hearken to any Arguments to induce them to forſake it. This made me ſay, that the Separation of *theſe* Perſons, and of theſe *only*, proceeded from nothing elſe but *Bigotry* and *Prejudice*. The *Examiner* might have known, if he had pleaſed, what I meant here by *Bigotry* from a Paſſage in the end, *viz.* "The reſolving that "the *firſt* Set of Principles Men happen to be "acquainted with, ſhall determine their Belief "and their Party all their Lives after, and they "muſt not be ſo much as *queſtioned* whether they "be in a Miſtake." Mr. *M.* may ſuppoſe what he pleaſes, but I do not take *all* Diſſenters to be ſuch ſort of Perſons: But it is no want either of Judgment or Charity to ſay, that *ſuch* of them as are, owe their Continuance in a State of Separation to Bigotry or Prejudice. As to *conſiderate* and *conſcientious* Diſſenters, of whom I believe there are very *many*, *my* Words have no ſort of Relation to them; being meant only of thoſe before deſcribed: nor will any thing in the Remarks *bear theſe harmleſs*, however Mr. *M.* may encourage them to depend upon it, only that he might charge *me* with another Contradiction of his *own* making.

Rem. p. 37.

His *other* Reflection is of a Piece with this, and not at all better founded—"No wonder (ſays he) "this Author perſuades the World in another "place, that all Non-conformiſts are alike, and "that ſober and moderate is much the ſame with "unſober and immoderate Non-conformity."

P. 30.

This

This he had ſaid before. " He (the *Remarker*) P. 15.
" would have the World look upon *all Non-con-*
" *formiſts* to be alike, and to conceive little or no
" difference between one ſort of them and ano-
" ther; thoſe that call themſelves ſober, and mo-
" derate, and charitable, being (according to
" *the Remarker*) as bad, or little better than the
" moſt unſober and uncharitable."

The manifeſt Injuſtice of this Repreſentation will appear to the Reader, if he pleaſe to turn to the Paſſage in the *Remarks*—The Words are theſe:

" But the Writer of the *Account* declares himſelf P. 16.
" concerned with the Vindication of nothing but
" ſober and charitable Non-conformity. I very Dr. *C—y.*
" well remember another who was for *moderate*
" Non-conformity. But ſo far as I can judge
" both the Epithets are Sounds without Senſe; or
" at beſt they make little or no Difference in fact
" between one ſort of Non-conformiſts and ano-
" ther."

The *Examiner* extends this to *all* Diſſenters in *general*; when it is ſpoken of ſome of their TEACHERS and WRITERS only, who are diſtinguiſhed among them by the different Appellations of *moderate* and *charitable*, and *immoderate* and *uncharitable* Non-conformiſts; as the Paragraph evidently ſhews. And (though I like not ſuch work) it would be eaſy to ſhew, that many of them who have *called themſelves ſober, and moderate, and charitable*, have behaved in much the ſame manner with *others* who paſſed under *another* Character. Mr. *Olive*, (as moderate a Conformiſt as ever lived) Dr. *Bennet*, and even that *great and good Biſhop* before-mentioned, experienced the Truth of the Obſervation above, and frequently complained of the *Immoderation* of Dr. *C—my*'s Defence of *moderate Non-conformity*.

What

What difference there is between the *preſent* Set of *ſober*, and *moderate*, and *charitable* Nonconformiſt *Preachers*, and *others*, there is no need to enquire. *Some* there be, no queſtion, who *are* really what they *call themſelves*; but if the *Author* of the *Exeter* Sermon, and the *Aſſembly* which ſo much approved it and gave their *Amen* to the *Preachers* Wiſhes and Prayers, call themſelves *ſober*, and *charitable*, and *moderate* Non-conformiſt Miniſters, I may with great Reaſon repeat what I ſaid before.—If this be the Caſe, "the Epithets of "ſober, and charitable, and moderate, are "Sounds without Senſe, and make no Difference "in fact, between one ſort of Non-conformiſts "and another."

This plain Account of the Words in the *Remarks*, from whence Mr. *M.* accuſes me of *throwing out Inſinuations againſt Diſſenters in general*, is a ſufficient Vindication of me from that *invidious Charge:* I ſolemnly declare I had no other *Meaning* in either of the Paſſages this Writer cavils at, than is juſt now given of them; and will only add, that if he will not allow the *Plea* I have made, he muſt fly in the Face of his own Declaration, (which I mentioned before, though he ſlips it over) that "he has no Right "to put an INTERPRETATION on MY "WORDS which *I myſelf will not admit of.*" How happy had it been, if the *Gentleman* could have prevailed with himſelf to *act* according to this *Declaration!*

Acct. p. 15.

This, I hope, will diſcharge me from the Accuſation of *Uncharitableneſs* and *Bitterneſs* towards Diſſenters, and endeavouring to perſuade the World they are *all alike*, and little or no Difference between them. I am very ready, on the contrary, to acknowledge, that *all* Non-conformiſts are not *alike*, nor *like* this Writer—that there

are

are many pious, charitable and peaceable Perſons among them, both Miniſters and People, who are far from approving his *ſowing this Diſcord among Brethren*; —— one particularly I have heard of (and he a chief Man among thoſe a certain Gentleman *has joined himſelf to*) has been heard to declare, that though he was *a Diſſenter*, he utterly diſliked Mr. *M.*'s Treatment of the *Author* of the *Trial*, and thought it highly *indecent* and *unjuſtifiable*.

For my own Part, though I am a Miniſter of the Church of *England*, (whether *Curate*, *Vicar*, or *Rector*, it matters not) and therefore muſt be ſuppoſed to think the *Diſſenters* blameable for not returning into the Communion of the Church of *England*, and that it is the indiſpenſable Duty of all Perſons to continue in that Communion, who are not, after a ſerious Examination, perſuaded that it requires ſomething *ſinful* and *unlawful* of them, yet I have ever been willing "to preſerve "a charitable Thought of, and obſerve a charita-"ble Behaviour to thoſe *pious and peaceable Diſ-"ſenters*, who, ſeeing things in another Light "than I do, conſcientiouſly refuſe compliance "with the Terms I approve of."

Mr. *M.* cannot greatly diſlike what I now ſay; becauſe it is pretty much the ſame with what himſelf has ſaid on the other ſide: So that, I hope, after all, I may not be ſo paſſionate and immoderate a Man, as he in his abundant Charity and Candour, has repreſented me to the World.

He accuſes me indeed, of *dipping my Pen in Gall*, and *bountifully diſperſing my Cenſures and Reflections upon him*; but I know of no *ſuch*, but what naturally ariſe from his *own Words*, and the Light in which *his* Behaviour towards a very worthy Man appeared to me. He charges me with *taking upon me to Cenſure him with as much Freedom*

as

as if I was acquainted with his Heart, and know perfectly the Springs and Views of his Actions; but I utterly disclaim all Pretensions of that kind as *impious* as well as *uncharitable*, and have give him no *Pretence* in the World to speak so falsely of me: He insinuates that I was in a *Passion* when I wrote some Part of the *Remarks*; but I thank God I *know this* to be as *false* as his Charge of *Calumny* now appears to be.

If there happen to be any thing in these Papers that may be thought too *severe* towards the *Examiner*, let it be considered what *Provocation* the Author has received from his rude and petulant Pen; and that there is little of that kind, but what is only the retorting his *own Phrase* upon him.

There are many Particulars in his *Pamphlet*, which you, Sir, and others may think deserve some Animadversion; but as I aim merely at my own necessary Vindication from the *Aspersions* and *Reflections*, and even *Calumnies* and *Slanders* cast upon me, I hope, this is sufficient for that purpose. I am sensible of many *Inaccuracies* and *Defects* in these short Papers too, which I must also leave to the *Candour* and *Charity* of the Reader; I could not satisfy myself to continue a *Day longer than was absolutely necessary* under such a Load of Infamy, and so send you them without the necessary *Revisal*.

I am, SIR,

Your most obliged Friend and Servant.

FINIS.

3 09944